



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|

10/085,362

02/27/2002

Petre Dini

50325-0634

6596

29989

7590

04/28/2005

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER, LLP  
2055 GATEWAY PLACE  
SUITE 550  
SAN JOSE, CA 95110

EXAMINER

MADAMBA, GLENFORD J

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2151

DATE MAILED: 04/28/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/085,362

Applicant(s)

DINI, PETRE

Examiner

Glenford Madamba

Art Unit

2151

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 February 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1-16, 18-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Marchand, U.S. Patent 6,714,515.

3. Claim 1 discloses a method for policy-enabled, contract-based management of a network operational support system [Figure 3], comprising the steps of:

requesting a policy view from one or more policy management systems that are logically separate from the operational support system, wherein the policy view comprises a set of required policies (Col 8, lines 10-22; Figure 3);

Art Unit: 2151

receiving one or more executable policies from the **22** [Figure 2], policy management system **21** capable of supporting the required policies of the requested policy view based on a contract that defines one or more criteria (i.e., bandwidth allocation) that the selected executable policies must satisfy (Col 3, line 60 – Col 4, line 6; Figure 3); and

implementing the requested policy view by executing the selected executable policies (Col 5, lines 8-17).

Claims 10, 24, and 25 are also rejected using the same reason discussed for Claim 1 as the claims are differentiated only by their statutory category.

4. Claim 2 asserts the method of claim 1 wherein the operational support system comprises a set of native policies indigenous to the operational support system, and further comprising the step of identifying a behavioral exception when none of the native policies is capable of supporting the requested policy view **42** (Figure 3; Col 7, lines 46-50).

Marchand, in his invention, discloses a Network Control Point (**NCP**), (hereinafter referred to as Bandwidth Broker or (BB) that has an internal Simple Policy Services **42** component (Col 7, lines 45-50). Marchand does not specifically teach that the Operational Support System (OSS) is comprised by the policies component; however,

as stated in the background for the applicant's invention, it is well known that for standard policy-based management systems, policy-based management systems are either embedded into the OSS or can only access one external policy management system (Page 3, [008]).

Claim 11 is also rejected using the same reason discussed for Claim 2 as the claims are differentiated only by their statutory category.

5. Claim 3 states the method of claim 2 wherein the requesting step is carried out only in response to a behavioral exception in the operational support system (Col 2, lines 20-23; Col 3, line 60 – Col 4, line 6; Col 7, lines 46-50)

Claim 12 is also rejected using the same reason discussed for Claim 3 as the claims are differentiated only by their statutory category.

6. Claim 4 stipulates the method of claim 1 wherein the requesting step further comprises the step of inventorying the available policy views of the policy management system 22 (Figure 2; Col 4, lines 1-30).

Claim 13 is also rejected using the same reason discussed for Claim 4 as the claims are differentiated only by their statutory category.

Art Unit: 2151

7. Claim 5 recites the method of claim 1 wherein the policy management system comprises an external policy engine, further comprising the step of causing the policy view to initiate the contract for the selection and importation of the executable policies from the external policy engine **13** (Figure 1), and **22, 27** (Figure 2; Col 3, lines 45-47; Col 4, lines 17-30).

Claim 18 is also rejected using the same reason discussed for Claim 5 as the claims are differentiated only by their statutory category.

8. Claim 6 notes the method of claim 5 wherein the contract comprises one or more pre-conditions, one or more post-conditions, one or more environmental requirements and one or more policy dependency rules (Col 2, lines 20-23; Col 2, line 60 – Col 3, line 14; Col 7, lines 56-64; Col 8, lines 10-22).

Claim 19 is also rejected using the same reason discussed for Claim 6 as the claims are differentiated only by their statutory category.

9. Claim 7 points to the method of claim 6 further comprising the step of causing the contract to apply the environmental requirements to the selected executable policies to enable the selected executable policies to run on the operational support system (Col 2, lines 20-23; Col 2, line 60 – Col 3, line 14; Col 8, lines 10-22).

Art Unit: 2151

Claim 20 is also rejected using the same reason discussed for Claim 7 as the claims are differentiated only by their statutory category.

10. Claim 8 references the method of claim 6 further comprising the step of causing the contract to apply the policy dependency rules to two or more of the selected executable policies when the behaviors of the two or more selected executable policies are in conflict with one another (Col 2, 20-25 & line 60 – Col 3, line 14; Col 6, lines 7-15; Col 7, line 55 – Col 8, line 22).

Claim 21 is also rejected using the same reason discussed for Claim 8 as the claims are differentiated only by their statutory category.

11. Claim 9 denotes the method of claim 1 wherein the policy management system comprises a policy export engine, and the receiving step further comprises the step of importing the selected executable policies from the policy export engine 22 (Figure 2; Col 4, lines 1-30 & 58-64).

Claim 22 is also rejected using the same reason discussed for Claim 9 as the claims are differentiated only by their statutory category.

12. Claim 14 asserts the method of claim 10 wherein the policy kernel comprises one or more policy access points 38 (Figure 3), and further comprising the step of enabling

Art Unit: 2151

the policy access points to provide an interface between the policy kernel and the policy management system **21, 39, or 41** (Figure 3).

13. Claim 15 denotes the method of claim 14 further comprising the step of inventorying the available policy access points of the policy kernel (Col 7, lines 21-45).

14. Claim 16 states the method of claim 14 wherein the policy access point is associated with a particular policy management system among a plurality of policy management systems (Figure 3, Col 7, lines 21-45).

15. Claim 23 discloses a method for policy-enabled, contract-based management of an operational support system implemented by a policy kernel, wherein the policy kernel comprises one or more policy access points and each policy access point is associated with a particular policy management system (Figure 3), the method comprising the steps of:

inventorying the policy access points of the policy kernel (Col 7, lines 21-45);

inventorying one or more policy views from one or more of the policy management systems, wherein the policy view comprises a set of required policies (Figure 2; Col 4, lines 1-30);

requesting one of the policy views from the inventory of policy views (Col 5, lines 22-25);



Art Unit: 2151

enabling the policy access point corresponding to the associated policy management system capable of supporting the requested policy view (Col 7, lines 21-45); causing a contract of the requested policy view to be initiated for the selection of executable policies from an external policy engine of the policy management system **31 & 22** (Figure 2); causing the contract to apply environmental requirements to the selected executable policies to enable the selected executable policies to run on the policy kernel (Col 2, lines 20-23; Col 2, line 60 – Col 3, line 14; Col 8, lines 10-22); causing the contract to apply dependency rules to two or more of the selected executable policies when the behaviors of the two or more selected executable policies are in conflict with one another (Col 2, lines 20-23, 47-55; Col 2, line 60 – Col 3, line 14; Col 7, line 60 – Col 8, line 22); importing the selected executable policies from a policy export engine of the policy management system **22** (Figure 2; Col 4, lines 1-30 & 58-64) ; and implementing the requested policy view by executing the selected executable policies (Col 4, lines 61-64 & Col 5, lines 8-22).

16. Claim 26 discloses a system for policy-enabled, contract-based management of operational support systems, comprising:

a policy kernel for executing policies of a policy view on the operational support system **NCP or BB** (Figure 3); and

Art Unit: 2151

one or more policy access points **38** that are communicatively coupled to one or more policy management systems **21, 39, or 41** (Figure 3)., the policy management system including one or more executable policies and one or more policy views, the policy views containing a set of required policies and a contract that defines one or more criteria that the executable policies must satisfy.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marchand in view of Schell et al (hereinafter Schell), U.S. Patent 6,314,520.

3. Claim 17 cites the method of claim 14 further comprising the step of disabling the policy access point to terminate the interface between the policy kernel and the policy management system.

In his invention, Marchand discloses that the RNS **21** is modified to behave as a policy server toward the network control point (NCP) or BB. The RNS controls radio resources and allocates radio resources to users. This is accomplished by adding the RNS to the policy framework and architecture, adding an interface between the RNS and BB, and adding functionality in both the BB and RNS to support the new interface (Col 6, lines 16-24). Marchand does not expressly disclose, however, that the interface points can be disabled to terminate the interface between the policy server interface and a particular external policy server or system.

In a similar endeavor, Schell, expressly teaches that an network interface card may be disabled to prevent subsequent workstation/server communication, while still allowing the workstation to operate as a public object (Schell; Col 7, lines 25-28). Thus, it would be obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the known features of the network interface card (NIC) described by Schell into Marchand's invention since the installation of a NIC card in a computing device allows existing workstations or servers to be coupled to the network and participate as a new element or member of the architecture (Schell; Col 8, lines 16-23).

### ***Conclusion***

1. The Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner.

2. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Stevens et al, Patent No. 6,539,425  
*Policy-Enabled Communications Networks*
- Candea et al, Patent No. 6,785,756  
*Methods and Systems for Multi-Policy Resource Scheduling*
- Perry et al, Patent No. 6,804,328  
*Intelligent Line Testing*
- Saaverda, Patent No. 6,459,702  
*Securing Local Loops for Providing High Bandwidth Connections*
- Tabares et al Patent Publication No. 2003/0088711 A1  
*Methods, Systems, and Computer Program Product for Instantiating a Device Driver for Communication with a Device By Dynamically Associating the Device*

*Driver at Run-Time with a Device-Specific and/or Service-Specific Software Component*

3. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Glenford Madamba whose telephone number is 571-272-7989. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Zarni Maung can be reached on 571-272-3932. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

  
**ZARNI MAUNG**  
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**

Glenford Madamba  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2151